

**Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Sustainable Design Roundtable**

June 9, 2005
Meeting Notes

Sponsored by the
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
Division of Capital Asset Management

through a grant from the
Massachusetts Technology Collaborative

Introduction

The Massachusetts Sustainable Design Roundtable held its third meeting on June 9, 2005 at the new Campus Center of the University of Massachusetts Boston. See Appendix A for a list of attendees. The agenda for the meeting is in Appendix B. Welcoming remarks were made by Aditi Pain, University of Massachusetts Boston. The long-term Roundtable plan was presented as well as a planning chart that laid out the future activities of the working groups (Appendix C). Status updates by the chairs of the seven Roundtable working groups followed. Their presentations focused on available research and programs, resource needs, and activities that the groups want to accomplish in the next six months. In the last part of the Roundtable session, representatives from the Massachusetts State College Building Authority and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority presented their current building efforts. A Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) representative talked about the MEPA review process and how it can support sustainable design.

The Roundtable would like to thank the University of Massachusetts Boston for hosting the June 9 meeting as well as Bank of America for sponsoring the breakfast before the meeting. This report contains the notes on the meeting. Links to the PowerPoint presentations and handouts used by the presenters at the June 9 meeting can be found on the website of the Massachusetts Sustainable Design Roundtable:

www.mass.gov/envir/Sustainable/initiatives/initiatives_roundtable.htm

Welcoming Remarks

Aditi Pain, University of Massachusetts Boston (UMB)

- The new UMB Campus Center became fully operational in March 2004. The UMB Campus Center is one of the greenest public buildings in the state and is the greenest building on campus. UMB is the only public university in Massachusetts to sign the International Tallloires Declaration. UMB was awarded the "Sustainable University of the Year" in 2004 by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA), the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the Operational Services Division (OSD).
- Some sustainable measures of the Campus Center include: no new parking created for the building; energy conserving vending misers; state-of-the-art HVAC control system; extensive indoor air quality measures; energy efficient lighting and lighting control systems, recycling and waste management; white roof; low-flow plumbing; and composting. Recycled materials, high durability fixtures and finishes, and certified harvested wood were used in the building. An air barrier membrane was used between the limestone façade and the interior walls. A more complete description of the sustainable measures at the Campus Center can be found on the Roundtable website (listed under 6-9-05 UMB Campus Center presentation).
- The shuttle between the MBTA JFK/UMass station and the campus is funded through fees charged for vehicle parking. In this way, people who drive to UMass subsidize those who take public transit.
- The Campus Center has a recycling and waste management program which involves built-in and independent units in dining areas and walkways, access to recycling on all six floors, composting, an innovative "chutes" design that allows for ease of disposal, and easy sorting at the dock area.
- The state sustainability program played an important role is helping to set up an annual campus sustainability tracking program.
- Why is the building not Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified? Aditi suggested that LEED was not the force it is now when the building was conceptualized. The timing just might not have been right, but they currently have adopted many LEED criteria even without the certification.

Roundtable Planning and Updates

Summary of the Research to be conducted for the MA Sustainable Design Roundtable

- The Roundtable plans to fund two consultant studies. The first consultant will summarize and add to the existing information already collected of state programs and legislation by the Roundtable. The Consultant will identify 3 to 5 state green building programs for further study. The Consultant will identify the best practices and mechanisms that these states have used for implementing green building programs for public buildings.
- Current plans are for a second consultant to conduct a practitioner survey on specific barriers to green building in Massachusetts.
- Additionally, internal work will continue on “the Massachusetts story”. Current and long-term state construction practices and plans by the various state agencies and authorities will be researched for inclusion in the final report by the Roundtable.
- Working groups will continue working in their individual specific research areas. For example, the metrics working group is evaluating various green building rating systems and their applicability to Massachusetts.

Long-Term Research Plan

- The Roundtable’s long term research plan was presented by EOE staff (Appendix C). A report to the Governor will be finalized in March 2006. The final recommendations of the Roundtable will be presented to the Governor in March 2006. The goal is to have the consultants and EOE staff conduct their research over the summer and present their findings at the September 15, 2005 Roundtable meeting. The working groups will incorporate this information into draft recommendations that they will present in the fall. The Roundtable will then develop draft final recommendations and get consensus on the top ten recommendations. The Roundtable will also prepare a final report to the Governor.

Working Group Updates and Planning Activities

- The working groups developed a list of action items that are described in the planning chart found in Appendix C. Below is a summary of the working group chairs’ comments made during the Roundtable meeting.

Keith Beasley, Education and Training:

- In terms of identifying educational methods, the group has found that some states have used more traditional educational methods while others have been less formal, e. g. case study methods. The group wants to understand what approach this Roundtable wants to take in Massachusetts. What are the most effective education and training methods and how are they implemented in other states? The group hopes the consultant will be able to answer this question.
- Sustainability education within K-12 schools and in higher education is critical.
- Q: Is there a state program that makes awards for green buildings?
A: Yes, the Northeast Sustainable Energy Association makes awards but they are not specifically for state buildings. The Office of Commonwealth Development (OCD) gives smart growth awards but these do not apply solely to green buildings.

Michael McAteer, Capital v. Operating Budget:

- The working group wants to be aware of building performance measurement systems that are currently being used as they discuss what is applicable to Massachusetts. The group wants to find the best metrics to measure green buildings and identify the costs and savings associated with green building.

- The group would like to identify the best life-cycle cost analysis method for measuring costs and benefits of sustainable design and make it an integral part of the budget planning process. Learning what other states have done will be helpful.
- Questions the group has asked itself: What are the best ways to organize a building's design phase? What is the role of training, enforcement, and oversight? We are doing a good job on projected performance, but how do we get to actual performance?

Jim Doolin, Sustainable Design Metrics:

- The group is trying to understand what to evaluate current metrics systems against.
- The group believes that all rating systems have plusses and minuses. Evaluating each system is not time effective. They believe LEED has market penetration. The group has focused on working with LEED.
- Overall effort is to reach environmental quality, robust public health, quality of life, and commerce. The group wanted to make sure whatever system they chose touched on all four of those issues.
- The metrics group proposes that the entire Roundtable use OCD's Sustainable Design Principles as priorities. The group is comparing LEED point categories to each of the Sustainable Design Principles.
- Q: Is the metrics group going to look at the comparison of CHPS and LEED done by DOE/MTC and others? Yes.
- Q: Will the metrics group address water quality policy and waste bans (banning unsorted construction and demolition waste, upcoming) when addressing Massachusetts priorities? Yes.
- Q: Alternatively, is the group going to look at LEED points that are not consistent with policies in MA?
- Q: Are there issues with adapting LEED? A: The USGBC is open to talking to state and local governments, but LEED can not be changed if you want to be certified. A state system cannot eliminate any of LEED's standing prerequisites, but can add to prerequisites for the state. (LEED +).

Quincy Vale, Bidding and Awarding Process:

- This working group is in a central position and is trying to implement all the other working groups' ideas. The group interfaces with the capital and operating costs working group and has had joint meetings with them. They have discussed LCCA and are trying to achieve the four principles addressed by the metrics group
- The group wants to investigate how Massachusetts is currently doing things, and how construction reform will affect sustainable design. What is state-of-the-art on construction programs nationally?

Mark Hanchar, Vision and Leadership:

- Everyone in this room should consider themselves sustainable design leaders or have close friends who are sustainable design leaders. This committee would like to have those people's names and be able to influence them through the final report.
- The idea is to identify links and make all research and findings accessible to the leaders. The Roundtable website should be a collection point for statistics, links, and resources.
- The Roundtable needs to identify metrics to become the desired future state. There should be no need for meetings because sustainable design should be in everyone's mind.

- The group would like input on the vision statement—preliminary thoughts were put together by Dan Arons. The group also thinks the OCD's Sustainable Development Principles are a good foundation. The vision statement should reflect everyone's input in the room, not only this working group.
- A survey of other state's programs and legislation was put together by Joanne Telegen, intern at DCAM, and will be given to the first consultant to work with as a foundation.

Paul Brown, Incentives:

- The first two steps are research oriented: identifying existing state incentives and best practices for incentives in other states and identifying stakeholders and their wants and needs. What do we want to do in Massachusetts?
- The group developed a draft of survey questions for Consultant Two to be added to the Standards, Codes and Regulations survey. This group wants to learn more about the adequacy of non-regulatory incentives to build green.
- The idea of cross collaboration between groups is very interesting and could be extremely useful.

Kim Cullinane, Standards, Codes and Regulations:

- The biggest challenge for this working group is to determine which of the building codes, standards and regulations present the greatest barriers and which provide the greatest benefits and incentives. To identify these key areas, the group wants to implement a practitioner survey, to be completed by Consultant Two.
- From the results of the survey, the group would like to determine the top 5-10 areas. The group is also interested in work of Consultant One (the state survey).
- While the two studies are going on, the group will be conducting their own work to identify states and localities that have worked with standards, codes and regulations. They would like to bring together all the studies and then make recommendations.
- It may turn out that the group wants to make recommendations to change the state's building code—the group is investigating that process now. However, they may not want to make changes to the code and instead seek other routes for change.

Scoping Document

- A Statement of Purpose for the Roundtable was circulated during the meeting (Appendix C). To what extent can this Roundtable make suggestions and recommendations for all programs—or should some of the programs be prioritized?

Department of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) Specifications Update

John DiModica, DCAM:

- DCAM as of now, in practice but not in policy, is using LEED. DCAM expects public building projects that are developed through its agency to be registered and certified through LEED. There is some thought internally about the future use of LEED and potentially only following LEED guidelines, but not formally registering/certifying with the USGBC program.
- Mark Kalin has been working with David Berkowitz and others at DCAM to create the new specifications for DCAM building projects. There are two different elements—one is a set of instructions to the developer and the other a set of green specifications. The hope is that the new specifications will lead to better adherence to sustainable design principles.

Mark Kalin, Kalin Associates:

- Quick facts: The new DCAM specification document is 1,600 pages and is available on CD. The specifications document was written in the new CSI Master format (six digits instead of five).
- These specifications will be used for all upcoming DCAM projects. This specification is the best the industry has to offer. Large and small firms will now have equal access to information. These specifications act as a tool to protect the owner's interest when public bids and sub-bids compete.
- The specifications are set up for projects to be designed and constructed at the LEED silver rating level. It is meant to be a tool that takes advantage of the best that is out there. The hope is that it will help control the sub-bid process and reduce change-orders as well as get buildings greener into the process. This is not optional for DCAM users. However, the state is not mandating LEED silver—yet.
- How does it get updated and maintained over time? David Berkowitz at DCAM works to keep it current. Every time you work with DCAM, you will have an updated copy.

Current Massachusetts Building Efforts**David Burson, Massachusetts State College Building Authority (MSCBA)**

- The Authority exists to support the nine state colleges in MA. Overseen by the Board of Education, the Authority acts as a private real estate developer in the public market. MSCBA is financially independent of the legislature.
- MSCBA is becoming more involved with campus life—campus centers, athletics, and parking facilities as well as dormitories. Projects in 2006 include residence hall repair and renovation, student life projects, and new construction.
- Building projects are funded by bonds that are supported by rents or other student fees and are amortized over 20 to 40-year terms. There is a constant challenge to keep up with existing building and bed stock. Increasingly, apartment/suite style living arrangements instead of dorm rooms are being built.
- The following LEED qualifications were implemented when building the new Salem State College Residence Hall: reduced site disturbance, storm water management, water efficiency, construction waste management, recycled content in interior spaces. Indoor environmental quality was key to keeping buildings marketable and filled.
- Some of the barriers included dealing with budget schedules, constantly being under pressure to keep up-front building costs down, and meeting political agendas.
- Future recommendations:
 - Make an early decision in the project programming/scoping phase to register for LEED certification to allow for advance energy modeling and water use calculations.
 - Encourage commitments by owner/architect/contractor teams throughout process to pursue additional green building strategies.
 - Monitor construction phase waste management and air quality plans.
 - Use lifecycle cost analysis (LCCA) to link sustainable building material and systems investments to long-term facility maintenance and operating costs.

Aisling Eglington, Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA)

- MEPA process overview: MEPA requires state agencies to evaluate the consequences of their actions. MEPA ensures that all possible measures are taken to avoid, minimize, and mitigate damage to the environment. MEPA review applies to projects above a certain size that involve state agency action. There are approximately 30-50 project filings/month, both public and private project types. The Secretary of the EOEA has the ability to trigger a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

- There are opportunities within MEPA to encourage sustainable design and some MEPA provisions that can be used to promote sustainable design. The MEPA office is dictated by jurisdiction on what they can encourage and what they can mandate. A public project with state funding has greater jurisdiction than a private project. MEPA encourages integrated planning at an early stage, interagency coordination, public involvement, alternatives analysis, requirements to avoid and minimize impacts, and mitigation requirements. MEPA is broad in scope which facilitates consideration of additional options (i.e. looking at all options before choosing one).
- MEPA is planning on creating guidance documents for developers/consultants to ensure sustainable design is adequately addressed.

Barbara Boylan, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)

- MBTA is a large authority with over 6,000 employees. The MBTA prepares a Capital investment Plan (CIP). Debt service takes up nearly 1/3 of the operating budget. The MBTA is making many investments and has varied capital including tunnels, tracks, stations, bridges, vehicles, maintenance shops. Many additions were made to the CIP this year. New buses were bought and additional improvements were made to accessibility, the silver line, general capacity, modernization, station renovation, the orange line and Mattapan station reinvestment, infrastructure investments, security and station management. Overall, the goals of the MBTA are to be a user-friendly and safe system.
- The MBTA is not subject to Chapter 149 and is not required to file sub-bids. MBTA has participated with OCD on transit oriented development. The MBTA is making efforts to be environmentally conscious and the authority is attentive to following sustainable design. It would be helpful to MBTA when trying to follow OCD sustainable design guidelines, if applicable techniques were easier to implement and the provisions were not arguable, i.e. mandatory.
- The MBTA website has information on doing business with the T, including a bidding system, Requests for Proposals, projects, and standard specifications.

Questions for Speakers/Overall Comments and Suggestions

- Q: In terms of sustainable design and waste management, when will there be recycling in MBTA stations? A: MBTA had recycling receptacles in prior to 9/11, but had to remove them due to terror fears.
- Some participants are feeling disconnected from the whole process. One in particular is on a working group that has not met in a while. Members would like more integration and communication between working groups. Possibly some groups could meet together that have not yet done so.
- Possibly publicize the schedules of the other task force working group meetings so anyone may attend.
- For the next meeting, a request was made to have breakout sessions again instead of only having speakers.
- It was noted that the bottom third of the links on the Roundtable website are not working.
- It was suggested that it would be valuable to have representatives from the Office of Administration and Finance and from the legislature, even as observers. Their observations/comments would provide excellent perspective. The Roundtable organizers must conduct internal discussions to determine if that is feasible or not—there were some concerns earlier.
- Q: At the next meeting, both consultants will present their work to the group. This will be an important meeting because it will be the kickoff for writing the recommendations. This meeting may have to be longer.

Comments: If the consultants could pass out their information a couple of days beforehand so their presentations could be shortened, that would work well. The general consensus was to keep the meeting short; an all morning session like this one is the right length.

- Q: The plan is to provide the second consultant with names of people to survey in order to expedite the process. Should the survey include people who have only done sustainable design projects or also people who have not worked on any sustainable design projects?

Comments: Developers who have not worked with sustainable design are valuable because they often have a completely different list of perceived barriers. It would be helpful to get two different perspectives.

A: The consensus was that participants want to target both groups of practitioners. A distinction will have to be made on the survey concerning knowledge level.

- In order to get names of people to survey, participants should send suggestions to committee chairs. Better to start with a broad list and edit it down. Roundtable members would like survey respondents to be geographically diverse, not Boston-centric.
- Are there still opportunities to get information out of the private sector too (in the survey)? A: The Roundtable is planning on surveying members of the private sector and is interested in asking questions about the barriers they have had specifically with sustainable design and working with the state. Want to include environmental planners as well as architects/engineers/construction managers, etc.

Participants should leave the meeting today with two broad questions to think about and be willing to discuss at the next Roundtable meeting on September 15, 2005:

1. The LEED discussion. Based on your knowledge of LEED, to what degree do you think it is the standard to use for Massachusetts?
 2. When you think of a final report from this Roundtable, how do you envision it? Look at Boston's effort as a starting point. Is it a good model for the state? Should we consider something broader and bigger or not? Are there other reports out there that you may have seen that we could use as a model? If so, please let us know.
- The audience needs to be defined for this document in order to come up with the answer to the last question. Also, how will it become a continuous improvement process? Ease into the recommendations? The report should start a process.

Appendix A

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS SUSTAINABLE DESIGN ROUNDTABLE

AGENDA

University of Massachusetts Boston Campus Center
Ballroom A, Third Floor
100 Morrissey Boulevard
Boston, Massachusetts
June 9, 2005
8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

- 8:00 – 8:30 **I. Registration and Continental Breakfast**
- 8:30 – 8:45 **II. Welcoming Remarks**
- A. Co Chairs, MA Sustainable Design Roundtable
 - B. University of Massachusetts Boston
- 8:45 – 10:00 **III. Roundtable Planning and Updates**
- A. Request for Responses/Consultants
 - B. Long-Term Roundtable Plan
 - C. Working Group Planning Chart
 - 1. Education and Training
 - 2. Capital vs. Operating Budget
 - 3. Sustainable Design Metrics
 - 4. Bidding and Awarding Process
 - 5. Vision and Leadership
 - 6. Incentives
 - 7. Standards, Codes & Regulations
 - D. Scoping Document
 - E. DCAM Specifications Update
- 10:00 – 10:15 **BREAK**
- 10:15 – 11:30 **IV. Current Massachusetts Building Efforts**
- A. Massachusetts State College Building Authority
 - B. Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act program
 - C. Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
- 11:30 – 11:40 **V. Next Steps**
- 11:40 – 12:30 **VI. Comments / Questions / Meeting Evaluation**

Desired Outcomes of Meeting:

- Complete presentations on MA building programs
- Reach agreement on long-term Roundtable planning process and target dates

Appendix B

Attendee List for 6-9-05 Sustainable Design Roundtable

David Amann	NSTAR
Anthony Amato	Eastern Research Group
Dan Arons	Architerra
Barbra Batshalom	The Green Roundtable
Keith Beasley	Massport
Barbara Boylan	Massachusetts Bay Authority
Paul S. Brown	Drummeys Rosanne Anderson
Joseph Buckley	Massachusetts School Building Authority
David Burson	Massachusetts State College Building Authority, Boston
Patricia Chaput	Division of Capital Asset Management
Kim Cullinane	Massachusetts Technology Collaborative
John DiModica	Division of Capital Asset Management
James Doolin	Massachusetts Port Authority
Aisling Eglinton	EOEA, Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act
Kenneth I. Fisher	Boston Society of Architects c/o Gensler Associates
Peter Fourtounis	DiMella Shaffer
Ray Frieden	Department of Housing and Community Development
Eric Friedman	Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
Mary Gately	Association of General Contractors of Massachusetts
Cynthia Greene	US EPA New England
William Grover	ICON Architecture
Mark Hanchar	Turner Construction
David Hancock	NAIOP c/o Child Bertman Tseckares
Barbara Hansberry	Office of Inspector General
Ray Johnson	Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency
Mark Kalin	Kalin Associates
Tim Love	Utile Inc.
Michael McAteer	National Grid USA
Eileen McHugh	Division of Energy Resources
Wendy McTyre	Meyer and Myer
Richard Murphy	KeySpan Energy
Joseph Naughton	RF Walsh
Marie Zack Nolan	Executive Office Of Environmental Affairs
Aditi Pain	University Of Massachusetts Boston
Steven Picardo	Bank of America
Andrea Ranger	Department of Education
William Reyelt	Department of Housing & Community Development
Christine Scott	Goody Clancy
Jennifer Somers	Environmental Health & Engineering Services
Forrest Speck	University Of Massachusetts Boston
Edward Starzec	Massachusetts Development Finance Agency
Joanne Telegen	Division of Capital Asset Management
Edward Tsoi	Tsoi/Kobus and Associates
Quincy Vale	Powerhouse Enterprises
Mark Warren	Sei Companies
Laura Wernick	HMFH Architects

Appendix C

Handouts from the June 9, 2005 MA Sustainable Design Roundtable meeting

Working Group Planning Chart
Statement of Purpose
Long -Term Roundtable Plan

**MA Sustainable Design Roundtable
Chart**

Working Group Planning

DRAFT as of 6/8/05

Working Group	Tasks/Objectives	Process	Target Date	Status
Education & Training	1. Identify stakeholders & types of educational methods	WG, Consultant 1	9/15/05	RFR1 posted 6/1/05
	2. Select best delivery methods for each group	WG, Consultant 1	9/15/05	
	3. Prioritize stakeholders to focus education on	WG, Consultant 1	10/30/05	
	4. Identify & advertise MA GB (green building) successes	Roundtable	ongoing	
	5. Identify projects in construction pipeline (for teaching)	WG, staff	9/15/05	
	6. Identify opportunities for higher ed training	WG	9/15/05	
	7. Identify places to get tech info/resources on GB	WG, staff	ongoing	
Capital v. Operating Cost	1. What mechanisms or best practices are different states using to fund incremental costs for design, construction and operating of GB	Consultant 1	9/15/05	RFR1 posted 6/1/05
	2. Identify how to include principals of integrated engineering, LCC analysis, and commissioning into capitals planning	staff/Consultant 2	9/15/05	RFR2 drafted for review
	3. Identify best metrics to measure performance of GB	Consultant 1/WG	9/15/05	RFR1 posted 6/1/05
	4. Identify best definition of costs & savings assoc. w/ GB	WG, Consultant 1&2	10/1/05	
	5. Identify best LCC methodology for measuring the cost and benefit savings associated with GB as integral part of budget planning process	Consultant 2, WG	9/15/05	RFR2 drafted for review
Bidding & Awarding Process	1. Understand state procurement process & regulations	WG, staff, intern	9/15/05	Ongoing
	2. Study potential of Ch 143 on promoting GB	WG, staff, intern	9/15/05	Need input from IG
	3. Determine how to communicate w/local officials on GB	WG, staff	9/15/05 & on	To work w/V&L/E&T WG's
	4. Conduct practitioner survey on barriers to GB	Consultant 2	9/15/05	Gathering Q's from WG's
	5. Identify mechanisms to implement best LCA	Consultant 1&2, WG	9/15/05	Invite A&F as part of SDR
	6. Identify ways to promote green programs/products	WG, Consultant 1	9/15/05&on	
	7. Develop means to ensure GB construct specs are achieved	WG, Consultant 1&2	9/15/05	

MA Sustainable Design Roundtable Chart		Working Group Planning			DRAFT as of 6/8/05
Working Group	Tasks/Objectives	Process	Target Date	Status	
Vision & Leadership	1. Identify/educate/support leaders	WG, staff, Roundtable	throughout		
	2. ID links to resources & how to make accessible to leaders	WG, staff	9/30/05		
	3. Identify metrics for future impacts	WG	9/30/05	Need input from other WG's	
	4. Survey other state E.O.'s & mandates & leaders on GB	Consultant 1, staff	9/15/05	RFR1 posted 6/1/05	
	5. Identify other mechanisms for providing V&L	Consultant 1, WG	9/30/05		
	6. Identify mechanisms for implementing state GB program	WG, Consultant 1	11/30/05	Draft recommendations	
Incentives	1a. Identify existing state incentives - draft	WG	4/1/05	Draft completed	
	1b. Identify existing state incentives - final	WG (+Consultant 2?)	9/15/05	Big task; perhaps split this	
		May need professional help.		up & assign a type of incentive to each member.	
	2. Identify best practices for incentives in other states	WG + Consultant 1	9/15/05	RFR1 drafted as of 5/16/05	
				WG version complete	
				Needs prof help	
	3a. Identify stakeholders and what they want & need - draft	WG	5/1/05	Draft done; needs review	
	3b. Identify stakeholders - final	WG	9/15/05	Reviewed Draft on 6/2;	
				discussed adding more stakeholders; needs further	
				debate	
	4a. Link stakeholders. & incentives to get desired interactions - draft	WG	5/1/05	Draft done; needs review	
	4b. Link stakeholders & incentives - final	WG + Consultant	9/30/05	Final to be done using consultant input.	
	5. Prioritize interactions to get WG focus	WG; staff	7/15/05		
		WG + Consultant 2	9/15/05	Needed for completion of remaining work.	
	7. Identify future incentives to promote sustainability in MA	WG; staff	10/15/05	Based on Consult. recs.	
	8. Identify incentives that also promote smart growth	WG, staff, SG proponents	10/30/05	Keep SG issues separate for now	

MA Sustainable Design Roundtable Chart		Working Group Planning			DRAFT as of 6/8/05
Working Group	Tasks/Objectives	Process	Target Date	Status	
	9. Write up results for report - WG draft - deliver to staff and consultant for final completion	WG	11/30/05	Draft report	
Sustainable Design Metrics	1. Identify & evaluate GB Rating Systems	WG, staff, intern			
	2. Survey best GB rating practices in other states	Consultant 1	9/15/05	RFR posted 6/1/05	
	3. Identify how to evaluate using LEED as certification tool	WG		Ongoing	
	4. Identify MA priorities	WG, staff	6/30/05	Draft proposal for 6/9 RT meeting	
	5. Adapt LEED to match MA priorities	WG, staff, intern	9/15/05		
	6. Research LEED vs. CHPS using graphic format	WG, staff, intern	8/31/05		
	7. Identify mechanisms for adopting metric	WG, staff	9/15/05	Collaborative w/ other WG's	
	8. Identify how to best evaluate building performance				
Standards, Codes & Regulations	1. Conduct practitioner survey on GB codes, regulations, standards, barriers/opportunities in MA	Consultant 2	9/15/05	Provide input on survey Qs	
				RFR2 drafted for review	
	2. Determine best practices in other states	Consultant 1	9/15/05	RFR1 posted 6/1/05	
	3. Investigate work done in other states, countries, cities on code/standard/regulatory changes.	WG	9/15/05	Start research.	
	4. Use results of practitioners survey (#1), consultant research	WG	11/15/05	Awaiting results of studies	
	on best practices (#2) and WG research (#3) to make recommendations.			and research.	
	5. Provide input to new MA Building Code edition, if applicable	WG	11/15/05	Awaiting results of studies and research.	

Massachusetts Sustainable Design Roundtable

Statement of Purpose

Through research, collaboration, and deliberation from January 2005 through February 2006, the goal of the Massachusetts Sustainable Design Roundtable is to develop a set of recommendations that, if adopted, will ensure incorporation of sustainable design and construction techniques and technologies into new construction projects that are funded, built or overseen by state government. In conducting its work, the Roundtable will focus on elements of sustainable design that include, but are not be limited to, energy and water consumption, material and resource use, site design, indoor air quality and waste generation.

When making its recommendations, the Roundtable will first consider those buildings that are built and/or funded by the Commonwealth, including projects under the jurisdiction of the Division of Capital Asset management, all executive state agencies, state colleges and universities, and public schools. Where possible, the Roundtable will also consider in its research other building projects that are overseen by state authorities as well as those that are reviewed by the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office (MEPA).

Long-Term Roundtable Plan (draft 6.09.05, page 1 of 2)

	June-05	July-05	August-05	September-05	October-05	November-05
Roundtable	9-Jun-05			15-Sep-05		
RT Presentations	MEPA, MBTA MA College Bldg Authority UMASS Bldg Authority WG Updates Consultant Study Descriptions			Consultant 1 on Best Practices/Mechanisms Consultant 2 on Practitioner Survey MA future building efforts		
RT Desired Outcomes	Consensus on long-term plan for RT, WG activities, scope					
Steering Committee		20-Jul-05	17-Aug-05		19-Oct-06	23-Nov-04
SC Activities	Develop Qs for Consultants 1&2 Develop potential interviewee list for survey	Work w/ Consultants 1&2	Work w/ Consultants 1&2 Review interim Consultant findings	Work w/ Consultants 1&2 Review final reports of Consultants	Present list of recommendations, 10 per group Develop criteria for choosing recs	Discuss Final Recs and choose Top Ten
Consultant 1	Begins 6/20	Summarize GB programs Choose 3-5 states to study in-depth	Interim Report due 8/15 Survey 3-5 state programs	Draft Final-9/15, Final-9/30 Contract ends 9/30/05 Identify best practices/mechanisms		
Consultant 2	Begins 6/30	Conduct practitioner survey	Analyze survey results Interim findings due	Draft Final-9/15, Final-9/30 Contract ends 9/30/05		
Metrics Working Group	WG identifies MA priorities Identifies rating systems Review draft scope of services	Evaluates rating systems Adapt LEED to match MA priorities	WG develops possible MA rating system	Get input from other WGs Review draft final Consultant report & provide feedback	Incorporate findings into recommendations	
Standards, Codes & Regulations WG	Review draft scope of services Develop Qs for Consultants			Review draft final Consultant report & provide feedback	Incorporate findings into recommendations	
Education & Training WG	Review draft scope of services Develop Qs for Consultants			Review draft final Consultant report & provide feedback	Incorporate findings into recommendations	
Capital & Operating Cost Working Group	Review draft scope of services Develop Qs for Consultants			Review draft final Consultant report & provide feedback	Incorporate findings into recommendations	
Bidding & Awarding Working Group	Review draft scope of services Develop Qs for Consultants			Review draft final Consultant report & provide feedback	Incorporate findings into recommendations	
Vision & Leadership Working Group	Review draft scope of services Develop Qs for Consultants			Review draft final Consultant report & provide feedback	Incorporate findings into recommendations	
Incentives WG	Review draft scope of services Develop Qs for Consultants			Review draft final Consultant report & provide feedback	Incorporate findings into recommendations	
Roundtable Staff	Support to WGs Hire Consultants 1 and 2 Provide Consultant 1 with GB research Provide Consultant 2 with Qs & potl. interviewees	Support to WGs Work w/ consultants to develop surveys Research long-term construction plans & projects	Support to WGs Summarize current MA GB efforts & practices Develop MA case studies	Support to WGs Review draft final report & coordinate & provide feedback	Support to WGs Review recs of WGs & provide feedback	Support to WGs Review recs of WGs & WG & provide feedback

Long-Term Roundtable Plan (page 2 of 2)

	December-05	January-06	February-06	March-06	April-06
Roundtable	8-Dec-05		9-Feb-05		
RT Presentations	Present Draft Final Recommendations Present Draft Final Report of Roundtable		Review and approve Final Report	Present Final Recs to Governor	
RT Desired Outcomes	Get Consensus on Top Ten Recommendations	Develop timeline	Review timeline, budget, & staff for implementation		
Steering Committee		18-Jan-06			
SC Activities		Discuss Final RT Report			
Consultant 1					
Consultant 2					
Metrics Working Group					
Standards, Codes & Regulations WG					
Education & Training WG					
Capital & Operating Cost Working Group					
Bidding & Awarding Working Group					
Vision & Leadership Working Group					
Incentives WG					
Roundtable Staff	Support to WGs Review recommendations of WG & provide feedback	Support to WGs	Support to WGs	Support to WGs	Support to WGs